



# 4 HOURS OF IMOLA



## EUROPEAN LE MANS SERIES 4 Hours of Imola 1<sup>st</sup> - 6<sup>th</sup> July 2025

### Decision no. 82

**From:** The Stewards  
**To:** INTER EUROPOL COMPETITION

**Date:** 15 July 2025  
**Time:** 19:35

**N° / Competitor:** 43 / INTER EUROPOL COMPETITION  
**Session:** Post Race  
**Offence:** Art. 14 of FIA International Sporting Code

1. On 9<sup>th</sup> July 2025, the Stewards received a petition from Inter Europol Competition by email, requesting a Right of Review in accordance with Article 14 of the FIA International Sporting Code ("the Code").
2. The request related to the Decision of the Stewards contained in document number 58 (no further action on Car 48 for alleged breach of article 12.2.2c of the ELMS Sporting Regulations).
3. A hearing was convened at 16:30 hrs CET on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2025 via Teams, and concerned parties were summoned (document numbers 115 to 116).
4. The Stewards of the ELMS at Imola conducted the hearing.
5. Attending the hearing were:  
On behalf of Inter Europol Competition – Sascha Fassbender  
On behalf of VDC Panis Racing - Mathilde Mocquery and Florent Gouin
6. This hearing was dedicated to determining, at the sole discretion of the Stewards (as specified in Article 14.3 of the Code) if "a significant and relevant new element is discovered which was unavailable to the parties seeking the review at the time of the decision concerned". In this case, the party was Inter Europol Competition and the decision concerned was document 58 issued during the ELMS Imola event.
7. Therefore, the Stewards were required to determine if any evidence presented to them was able to meet each and every one of the above criteria namely significant, relevant, new and unavailable to the party seeking the review at the time of the decision concerned.
8. Inter Europol Competition cited one issue which it regarded as meeting these criteria. This was the live TV broadcast of car 48 undertaking a pit stop and allegedly having one wheel on or beyond the yellow line of the pit box, in violation of article 12.2.2.a of the ELMS Sporting Regulations. The material submitted with the petition was a document containing 7 screenshots taken from the live TV broadcast.
9. Inter Europol Competition provided no additional evidence during the hearing but reinforced its position outlined in its written submission.
10. The Stewards adjourned the hearing at 16:45 hrs to determine the existence or otherwise of any "elements" which complied with all the criteria required in Article 14.1.1 of the Code.

**Decision:**

11. Regarding the live TV broadcast footage, the Stewards:

- a. Determine that it is significant,
- b. Determine that it is not new,
- c. Determine that it was available to Inter Europol Competition (the party seeking the review) at the time of the decision,
- d. Determine that it is relevant.

12. Therefore, the Petition for the Right of Review is REJECTED because the evidence is not new and was available to Inter Europol Competition at the time of the Decision.

**Reason:**

13. In relation to point 11a, the live TV broadcast is significant as it provides a different view of the pit stop of car 48, compared to the video from the pit official, available to the Stewards at the time of the inquiry regarding the pit stop of car 48.

14. In relation to 11b, the live broadcast TV footage is not new as it was freely available to all parties during the race and specifically at the time of the incident (the pit stop of car 48).

15. In relation to 11c, the live TV broadcast was available to the party seeking the review (Inter Europol Competition) at the time of the decision. The Stewards note that due to the TV broadcast being live, it was available to the party seeking the review (Inter Europol Competition) from the time of the pit stop and subsequently when the Provisional Classification was published and when the decision was published.

The Stewards note that the live TV broadcast was available at the time of the pit stop, however they were not watching the live TV as they were fully committed to dealing with other incidents that had arisen during the race. They also note that the live broadcast was not brought to their attention either at the time of the pit stop, at the end of the race or when the inquiry was held.

16. In relation to 11d, the footage is relevant. The footage provides a clearer view of the pit stop when compared to the video footage submitted by the pit lane official.

17. The Stewards also note that the TV broadcast video was freely available, however no Protests or Appeals were received in connection with this specific pit stop of car 48 or the subsequent decision (Decision No. 58).

Competitors are reminded that, in accordance with Article 14.3 of the Code, this decision is not subject to appeal.



Peter Roberts  
Chairman of the Panel



Palle Christiansen  
International Steward



Valerio Brizzolari  
National Steward